REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 12-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-10 and 12-18 are amended. No new matter is added. Support for the amendments can be found for example, at Fig. 6. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Dinh in the August 13, 2007 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon (U.S. Patent No. 6,184,856) in view of Oh-e (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,732) and further in view of Hou (U.S. Patent No. 6,113,810); rejects claims 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon in view of Oh-e and Hou, and further in view of Comiskey (U.S. Patent No. 6,376,828); and rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon in view of Oh-e and Hou, and further in view of Shirochi (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,654). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In particular, according to the present application "the transmitted light is absorbed or reflected by the particles adhered onto the display substrate, and the reflected light is transmitted again through the filters." See the Abstract and Figures 6, 8, 9A and 9B that show that the display medium is reflective. Moreover, the presently claimed invention is directed to a <u>reflective</u> image display medium, device, and method.

However, Gordon discloses "a transmissive electrophorestic color display is comprised of a plurality of color pixels; each uniformly illuminated from the rear by a backlight." See the Abstract and Figures 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A and 4B that show that backlight is required below the display, and that the view side is above the display. Gordon,

thus, does not teach or suggest that an image display medium is reflective as recited in the claims.

Gordon and Oh-e cannot be combined because it will change the principle of operation of Gordon. See MPEP §2143.01 VI. The proposed modification cannot change the principle of operation of a reference. Gordon's display cell is comprised of a suspension of charged, black or colored light-absorbing pigment particles in a light-trasmissive fluid. See the Abstract. Oh-e's display pixel is a liquid crystal display based on light polarization.

Gordon and Hou cannot be combined because it will not be able to display color or white. See MPEP §2143.01 V, the proposed modification cannot render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. If the particles of opposite polarity are put in Gordon's light-transmission fluid, the display will only show black or dark when light transmission is desired. When the voltage is applied to electrode to collect the particles of one polarity at the lower electrode and to allow the light transmission, the particles of other polarity adhere to upper electrode and blocks the light transmission.

For at least the foregoing reason, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10 and 12-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel

Registration No. 51,122

JAO:HXT/tjx

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: October 15, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. Box 19928 Alexandria, Virginia 22320 Telephone: (703) 836-6400 DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461